

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

05 3 89 10 23 2005

In the

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

**BILL BUTLER**

**v.**

**DAIMLERCHRYSLER CORPORATION AND  
COMPUWARE CORPORATION D/B/A  
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

---

**On Petition For Writ of Certiorari**

**To The UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

---

**FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

**BILL BUTLER  
IN PRO SE  
C/O JACKIE LeMON  
28675 KARAM DRIVE  
MADISON HEIGHTS, MI 48071**

## IN THE FEDERAL COURT OF APPEALS

The federal court of appeals affirmed with the federal district court in dismissing the case due to the doctrine Res Judicata.

### Questions Presented for Review.

Why did the Res Judicata overrule Collateral Estoppel and barred the plaintiff from federal court proceedings?

## IN THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Since Judge Feikens and Judge Morgan didn't address any of the plaintiff's topics he brought up in the June 29, 2004 oral argument the plaintiff filed a complaint of judicial misconduct with the executive of the sixth circuit. The Chief judge ruled there were no judicial misconduct due to the merits in the case. The plaintiff went on to petition the judicial in this matter of judicial misconduct.

### Questions Presented for Review.

What do the merits of this case have to do with two federal judge's misconduct in not discussing the topics brought to their attention by the plaintiff in oral argument, both in the chief judge and judicial council decision?

## IN FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT

On June 29, 2004 the plaintiff/defendants was invited to appear in front of Judge Morgan for an oral argument which the judge was to write a report and recommendation to district Judge Feikens. The case was dismissed due to the doctrine res judicata. The plaintiff was allowed to cite a case similar to his own, he discussed the doctrine of Collateral Estoppel and spoke to Judge Morgan about his inability to obtain employment because of this injustice.

### Questions Presented for Review

Why did the Res Judicata overrule Collateral Estoppel and barred the plaintiff from federal court proceedings?

Why didn't Judge Morgan discuss the case the plaintiff was allowed to cite during oral argument in her report?

Why didn't Judge Morgan discuss the doctrine of Collateral Estoppel in her report?

Why didn't Judge Morgan discuss the plaintiff's issue of not being able to obtain employment because of this injustice?

## IN MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT

The plaintiff submitted his paper work to the court and motion the court for immediate consideration. He was granted immediate

consideration within 2 days without opposing motion from the defendants. He then was denied his leave from the court of appeals because the Supreme Court stated they were not persuaded that this court should review these questions.

#### Questions Presented for Review

Why did the same paperwork, that granted the plaintiff immediate consideration within just 2 days, did not persuade the Supreme Court to even address the plaintiff's questions from the Court of Appeals decision?

#### IN MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS

The court of appeals affirmed with the lower court stating the plaintiff provided no evidence. The court also stated, challenging the official's credibility does not create admissible evidence in support of plaintiff's claim.

#### Questions for Review

Why didn't the court of appeals even address the plaintiff's evidence the private investigator and newspaper reports?

Why didn't the Court of Appeals order a new telephone deposition

of the witness B. Hurley to find out the true?

Did the witness B. Hurley obstruct justice?

What are the perils for lying under oath in the court of law twice?

Did the witness B. Hurley receive any such perils?

#### IN MICHIGAN OAKLAND COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT

The plaintiff's evidence, both his private investigator and newspaper reports were ruled by Judge Kuhn if admissible it does not support the plaintiff's allegation against the defendant companies, stating that they received different information the the plaintiff's prospective employers. Judge Kuhn continues stating that B. Hurley telephone records does not prove that she spoke to anyone or what the content of any conversation might have been.

#### Questions Presented for review

Why would Judge Kuhn rule the plaintiff's evidence in admissible

Why would Judge Kuhn state the defendants companies pick and choose what they were say about the plaintiff?

Why didn't Judge Kuhn order a new telephone deposition with the witness B. Hurley after receiving her telephone records?

Did the witness B. Hurley obstruct justice in this case?

**IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN 50<sup>TH</sup> DISTRICT**

**Due to a low mediation award of \$1000 (based on the affidavit provided by the witness B.Hurkey her first lie) Judge Kuhn remanded the case to the district court. A trial was scheduled but the day of the trial no jury available. Judge Brown sends the case back to Judge Kuhn.**

**Questions Presented for review**

**Why was this case sent to district court against Michigan civil code 11.53?**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>DISCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>JURISTITION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF THE CASE</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>INDEX TO APPENDIX</b>	<b>7</b>

## **PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS**

Petitioner is Bill Butler, a mechanical engineer, a Michigan resident that has been for on to jobless/homeless list.

Respondents are DaimlerChrysler Corporation and Compuware Corporation doing business as Professional services.

### **Attorneys for the respondents:**

For DaimlerChrysler Corporation  
RICHARD M. TUYN (P29091)  
KRISTIN R. BRINKLEY (P59275)  
Cattel, Tuyn & Rudzewicz  
33 Bloomfield Hills Parkway, Suite 120  
Bloomfield Hills, Mi 48304  
(248) 593-6400

For Compuware Corporation d/b/a  
Professional Services  
JOHN J. RONAYNE, III (P23519)  
ELISE N. REED (P52816)  
Bernardi, Ronayne & Glusac  
A Professional Corporation  
1058 Maple Street, Suite 100  
Plymouth, Mi 48170  
(734) 416-1780



## **JURISTITION**

**United States Court of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit Order**  
**Filed on July 28, 2005 the district court's order is therefore**  
**affirmed. Rule 34(j)(2)(C), Rules of the Sixth Circuit.**

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**FRANK B. HALL & CO., ET AL., Appellants v. LARRY W.**  
**BUCK, Appellee**

**No: C14-82-234-CV**

**COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, Fourteenth District, Houston**

**678 S.W.2d 612; 1984 Tex. App. LEXIS 5886**

**July 26, 1984**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Work references are the most important aspect of anyone's job search, from baby sitting to the chief justice of the United States of America. If you state on your resume that you work for a certain company/companies and they both state that they have no record of your employment. That's makes you a liar and immediately you chances of obtaining employment with company at that time or any time in the future a simply gone... They just don't want anything to do with you. If you try to explain you situation to the people you interview with the look at you and wonder what you did for any company to do this to you. **I did nothing.** The result is a jobless/homeless mechanical engineer with no end in sight.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

Briefly let's step back in this case and see what we have:

1. A mechanical engineer that against all odds receives his degree...one year going night school to get college prep classes, two years day school to receive his associate's degree and six years night school to receive his bachelor's degree
2. Two companies thru their wreckless disregard for the truth state, no record of that employee.
3. A witness that lied under oath twice.
4. A circuit court judge that states the defendants companies would have told the plaintiff's potential employer something different that what his private investigator and newspaper reporter learned.
5. A state court of appeal that did not even consider the plaintiff's private investigator and newspaper reporter and rule the plaintiff provide no evidence.
6. The state supreme court that granted the plaintiff immediate consideration in two days and the stated that they were not persuaded that there court should address the plaintiff's questions.

7. A federal magistrate that did not include what the plaintiff said  
in her court during oral argument.
8. A judicial council that states there was no judicial misconduct.
9. A federal district judge that dismisses the case.
10. A federal court of appeals that affirms with the district judge.
11. This wreckless disregard for the truth and lawsuit  
has left the plaintiff/petitioner unemployable. No company  
will ever consider him now for employment.

#### CONCLUSION

Bill Butler, petitioner has mailed this petition on  
September 29 2005.

*Bill Butler*